

### **REMARKS**

This amendment responds to the Office action dated March 02, 2007.

Claims 1, 10, 14, 18 and 19 are independent claims. Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and therefore comprise all the limitations therein. Claims 11-13 depend from claim 10 and therefore comprise all the limitations therein. Claims 15-17 depend from claim 14 and therefore comprise all the limitations therein.

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Barry et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,825,943, hereinafter "Barry."

MPEP §2131 provides:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."

*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

and

"The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent claim 1 has been amended and comprises the elements of:

creating a Page-Independent Spool File (PISF) index file that is distinct from said spool data file, but based on data in said spool data file, wherein said PISF index file identifies portions of said spool data file required to print independently-formatted page-specific units corresponding to each page of said document;

manipulating said PISF index file, after creation of said PISF index file, to *effect a document page format manipulation option, wherein said document page format manipulation option is selected from the group consisting of page order, page copies, page scaling and page placement, [emphasis added]* thereby producing a manipulated PISF index file; and

*using a print processor customized to use said manipulated PISF index file, [emphasis added]* generating printer-ready data from portions of said spool data file identified by said manipulated PISF index file.

Barry discloses a method for splitting a print job into several portions for parallel RIP processing. Barry further discloses the use of a “control file” that contains parameters for managing the several portions for parallel RIP processes. The control file is updated to keep track of the various portions of the print job while they are being apportioned. However, this control file is not analogous to the page-independent index file of this claim.

The control file of Barry performs the function of splitting a print file for multiple concurrent RIP operations. Barry does not teach the use of a control file that changes the output print format in any way. Nor does Barry teach any form of document page format manipulation.

Using the index file of the currently claimed embodiments of the applicant's invention, a *custom print processor* (emphasis added) can manipulate the file to achieve different sheet assembly, formatting options and formatting characteristics. Nowhere in Barry is there a description of a page-independent index file that can be used to manipulate individual pages. Barry does not disclose a page-independent index file that can be used to achieve different sheet assembly, formatting options and formatting characteristics. The control file of Barry effectuates no changes that effect the output format or output characteristics of the print job.

Additionally, in the invention of Barry, multiple print jobs corresponding to an original print job are sent to multiple processors. Each of the multiple print jobs comprises the entire print job with substitute RIP instructions (column 8, lines 12-20). This requires no modification or customization of a print processor to specially handle these jobs.

Independent claim 1, as amended, is therefore allowable in its present form. Claims 2 and 4-9 depend from claim 1 and comprise the limitations therein. The rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4-9 should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 10 has been amended and comprises the elements of:

manipulating a PISF index file to effect document formatting, wherein said document formatting comprises a *document page format manipulation option*, wherein said *document page format manipulation option* is selected from the group consisting of *page order, page copies, page scaling and page placement*, [emphasis added] after creation of said PISF index file, wherein said PISF index file comprises independently-formatted page-specific units corresponding to each page of a document, wherein said independently-formatted page-specific units are based on document-wide, persistent, page formatting data in a spool data file, thereby producing a manipulated PISF index file; and using *a print processor customized to use said manipulated PISF index file*, [emphasis added] generating printer-ready data from portions of said spool data file identified by said manipulated PISF index file.

As argued above in relation to independent claim 1, Barry does not disclose these elements. The rejection of independent claim 10 and claims 12 and 13 which depend from claim 10 should therefore be withdrawn.

Independent claim 14 has been amended and comprises the element of “using a print processor customized to use said PISF index file, accessing data indexed in said independently-formatted units to form a print job.” This element is not disclosed, as argued above in relation to independent claim 1, in Barry. The rejection of independent claim 14 and claims 15-17 which depend from claim 14 should therefore be withdrawn.

Independent claim 18 has been amended and comprises the element of “a customized print process capable of interfacing with said PISF index file to generate printer-ready data from portions of said spool data file identified in said PISF index file.” This element is not disclosed, as argued above in relation to independent claim 1, in Barry. Independent claim 18, as amended, is therefore allowable, and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 19 has been amended and comprises the elements of:

manipulating said PISF index file, after creation of said PISF index file, to  
*effect a document page format manipulation option, wherein said*  
*document page format manipulation option is selected from the group*  
*consisting of page order, page copies, page scaling and page*  
*placement, [emphasis added] thereby producing a manipulated PISF*  
index file; and  
*using a print processor customized to use said manipulated PISF index*  
*file, [emphasis added] generating printer-ready data from portions of*  
said spool data file identified by said manipulated PISF index file.

These elements are not disclosed, as argued above in relation to independent claim 1, in Barry. Independent claim 19, as amended, is therefore allowable, and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

The examiner has rejected claims 3 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,825,943, hereinafter Barry, in view of the applicant's admitted prior art in the background of the invention, hereinafter "background."

Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1, and claim 11 depends from independent claim 10.

Independent claim 1 has been amended and comprises the elements of:

creating a Page-Independent Spool File (PISF) index file that is distinct from said spool data file, but based on data in said spool data file, wherein said PISF index file identifies portions of said spool data file required to print independently-formatted page-specific units corresponding to each page of said document;

manipulating said PISF index file, after creation of said PISF index file, to *effect a document page format manipulation option, wherein said document page format manipulation option is selected from the group consisting of page order, page copies, page scaling and page placement, [emphasis added]* thereby producing a manipulated PISF index file; and

*using a print processor customized to use said manipulated PISF index file, [emphasis added]* generating printer-ready data from portions of said spool data file identified by said manipulated PISF index file.

Barry discloses a method for splitting a print job into several portions for parallel RIP processing. Barry further discloses the use of a “control file” that contains parameters for managing the several portions for parallel RIP processes. The control file is updated to keep track of the various portions of the print job while they are being apportioned. However, this control file is not analogous to the page-independent index file of this claim.

The control file of Barry performs the function of splitting a print file for multiple concurrent RIP operations. Barry does not teach the use of a control file that changes the output print format in any way. Nor does Barry teach any form of document page format manipulation.

Using the index file of the currently claimed embodiments of the applicant’s invention, a *custom print processor* (emphasis added) can manipulate the file to achieve different sheet assembly, formatting options and formatting characteristics. Nowhere in Barry is there a description of a page-independent index file that can be used to manipulate individual pages. Barry does not disclose a page-independent index file that can be used to achieve different sheet assembly, formatting options and formatting characteristics. The control file of Barry effectuates no changes that effect the output format or output characteristics of the print job.

Additionally, in the invention of Barry, multiple print jobs corresponding to an original print job are sent to multiple processors. Each of the multiple print jobs comprises the entire print job with substitute RIP instructions (column 8, lines 12-20).

This requires no modification or customization of a print processor to specially handle these jobs.

The background merely recites page formatting options provided by some printing devices. The background cited by the examiner in combination with Barry does not disclose the above-listed elements of amended claim 1. Independent claim 1, as amended, is therefore allowable in its present form, and thus claim 3 is allowable.

Independent claim 10 has been amended and comprises the elements of:

manipulating a PISF index file to effect document formatting, wherein said document formatting comprises a *document page format manipulation option*, wherein said document page format manipulation option is selected from the group consisting of page order, page copies, page scaling and page placement, [emphasis added] after creation of said PISF index file, wherein said PISF index file comprises independently-formatted page-specific units corresponding to each page of a document, wherein said independently-formatted page-specific units are based on document-wide, persistent, page formatting data in a spool data file, thereby producing a manipulated PISF index file; and using *a print processor customized to use said manipulated PISF index file*, [emphasis added] generating printer-ready data from portions of said spool data file identified by said manipulated PISF index file.



As argued above for claim 3 in relation to independent claim 1, Barry and background do not disclose these elements. Therefore claim 10, and claim 11 by dependence on claim 10, are allowable in present form.

Further, there is no teaching in Barry to suggest manipulating the control file to effectuate changes in the output print format. The invention in Barry is motivated by parallel processing, while the currently claimed embodiments of the applicant's invention are directed toward supporting driver-independent, printer-independent page manipulation options in a printing system. Due to the absence of some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination of the references, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be properly made, and this rejection of claims 3 and 11 should be withdrawn.

In light of the arguments above, all claims are considered to be novel, non-obvious and patentable in view of the cited art. The applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider the rejections of these claims. The examiner is invited to contact applicant's attorney directly for any reason.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott C. Krieger/  
Scott C. Krieger  
Reg. No. 42,768  
Tel. No.: (360) 828-0589